REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended to call for a method of enabling two piconets, that communicate within each piconet using a wireless protocol, to communicate with one another (between the piconets), despite the fact that the two piconets are at distances greater than the range possible with either piconet. For example, each piconet may include a device that is capable of communicating within the piconet and also to communicate over a different wireless protocol at a greater range so as to reach the other wireless piconet.

The cited Walley reference, in Figure 1, shows a system in which a phone and its base station communicate with one another. All the phones communicate with each other, as indicated at 118. Thus, there are not different piconets that are established. Moreover, the base station does not communicate over a distance which is greater than the range of any of the piconets. For example, the communication link 108 is a Bluetooth piconet in Figure 1, which is a short range communication. Thus, everything communicates in the short range and there is no ability to extend the range of the network.

Figure 5 shows a base station and hand set pair, and it is clear that the base station 500 communicates over a line 538 because there is a line interface 504. Notice that there is no antenna between the base station 500 and the line. Thus, the lines L1 and L2, in Figure 1, communicate with a base station, such as BS1, over a line 102 which is not a wireless link. Thus, the only way to extend the range of the network would be over the phone lines L1 and L2, but communication to these phone lines is done, not over a wireless protocol, but over a wired connection.

The system shown in Figure 7 includes a series of answering machines that communicate with a base station 3, but there is no indication of any extension of the range of any element since the communication links 108 and 110 are short range links.

Claim 10 shows a system for bridging two networks. Note that the link 1012 is undesirable. It would cause interference between the two networks and would indicate that the two networks are in range. Thus, the link 1012 would not extend the range of the networks. Note links 1008 and 1010 are RF links, but links 1002, 1004, and 1006 couple the bases to the lines L1 and L2. These links are not specifically described as hard wired but the links 1002, 1004, 1006 correspond to the similarly numbered links 102, 104, and 106, which correspond to

the link 538 in Figure 5 for the base station, which is not shown near an antenna and is, therefore, clearly indicated not to be a wireless link.

Therefore, the cited reference does not teach two piconets that communicate over a third wireless protocol using devices within the piconet that communicate within the piconet using the wireless protocol of the piconet and outside the piconet via a third wireless protocol which is a longer distance protocol.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2007

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation